

**ON THE RELEVANCE TO THE AVAILABILITY OF A NAME OF THE
AUTHOR'S INTENTIONS WHEN PUBLISHING THAT NAME; COMMENT
ON VIEWS EXPRESSED BY MR. FRANCIS HEMMING**

By H. OLDROYD, M.A.

(British Museum (Natural History), London)

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)486)

Mr. Francis Hemming, Secretary to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature, in a note published in this *Bulletin* (Vol. 2: 211) has expressed the view that an author's intentions not only are irrelevant (*Opinion* 4) but should be irrelevant to the availability of a published name. I should like to comment on the fundamental question of principle involved.

2. In the case quoted by Mr. Hemming (*Arieticerus* Quenstedt, 1883) and in another case which comes to my mind (*Bactria* Meigen, 1820) the author of the name concerned had no intention of proposing a new name that was to be used. He mentioned the name in passing for other reasons, commendable or otherwise. That such a name should be seized upon and brought into general use at the time of publication is unreasonable enough; that it should be discovered decades later and used in preference to a long-established name seems to me incredibly perverse.

3. It is true that Mr. Hemming states that on the "rare" occasions when this occurs, the Commission could give a special ruling under its plenary powers. In my view, however, it is wrong in principle that the Code should permit such practices. In a science in which we are compelled to refer constantly to works published fifty, one hundred or even nearly two hundred years ago, it seems to me quite unreasonable obstinately to set aside the author's own intentions as merely "subjective" and to apply his names according to a set of rules devised a century after his death.

4. I do not believe it is possible to eliminate the "subjective" element from nomenclature, any more than this element can be "wholly excluded from any code of law," as Mr. Hemming would have it. English law, at any rate, is full of subjective elements, and the question of intention—with phrases such as "with malice aforethought," or "with intent to deceive"—is an integral part of it.

**COMMENT ON MR. FRANCIS HEMMING'S NOTE ON AN ISSUE RAISED IN
THE PROPOSALS SUBMITTED BY DR. W. J. ARKELL REGARDING THE
NAMES "ARIETICERUS" SEGUENZA, 1885, and "SEGUENZICERUS" LEVI,
1896 (CLASS CEPHALOPODA, ORDER AMMONOIDEA)**

By HELMUTH HÖLDER

(Geologisch-Paleontologisches Institut, University of Tübingen, Germany)

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)486)

Zu *Arieticerus*/*Sequenziceras* (Arkell, 1951, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* 2: 208-210). Vor dem Vorschlag F. Hemming's (1951, *ibid.* 2: 211-213), die Gültigkeit eines Namens unabhängig von der die Gültigkeit betreffenden Absicht seines Autors zu bejahen, ist nach Anzicht des Referenten zu warnen. Hier sollte durch den jeweils revidierenden Autor von Fall zu Fall entschieden werden. Die Namensform *Arieticerus* hat Quenstedt gegen *Arieticerus* Waagen angewogen, ohne, wie sich eindeutig erkennen lässt, die Einführung von *Arieticerus* in das Schrifttum zu beabsichtigen. Es muss aber möglich sein, über die Form eines gegebenen Namens zu diskutieren, ohne dass eine erwogene andere Form sogleich nomenklatorische Gültigkeit erlangt. Der Name *Arieticerus* Seguenza ist also durch Quenstedt nicht präokkupiert und kann statt des viel schwerfälligeren, nichtsagenden *Sequenziceras* erhalten werden, wenn nicht nach Anzicht des Referenten nicht notwendige, dem entgegenstehende Allgemeinregelung im Sinne von F. Hemming erfolgt.